DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 826 CS 202 338

AUTHOR White, Edward M.
TITLE Comparison and Contrast: The 1974 California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination.
INSTITUTION English Council of the California State Univ. and Colleges.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 88p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of the Chancellor, the California State University and Colleges, 5670 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90036 ($1.50, make checks payable to The State of California)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; *College Freshmen; *Comparative Analysis; *Composition (Literary); Educational Research; *Equivalency Tests; Higher Education; *Literature Appreciation; Measurement Instruments; Test Construction; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS California; *College Level Examination Program

ABSTRACT

Since the 1974 California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination was a repeat of the 1973 examination, the report contained in this document should be viewed as a supplement to the 1973 report. The test was administered in May 1974 to 3,639 students with 1,036 receiving proficiency credit. Once again, it consisted of a 90-minute essay test constructed and graded by California State University and Colleges English faculty, and the 90-minute objective CLEP Subject Examination, "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature." The major conclusion of this supplementary report is that the English Equivalency Examination appears to be accomplishing its goal. The use of equivalency tests for general education credits deserves closer examination and raises a number of larger philosophical questions about teaching. (The results of this report are presented in both narrative and table form, and the appendixes include a statistician's report and statistical tables for the use of researchers.) (RB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

THE 1974 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES FRESHMAN ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION

EDWARD M. WHITE
DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT
FOR
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
English Council

Project 73-217
Fund for Innovation and Improvement

October 1974

2

This monograph is one in a series describing the results of projects implemented under The California State University and Colleges Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface III

I. Summary and Fact Sheet. 1

II. Administration of the Test. 5

III. The Essay Test. 15

1. Question 1. 16

a. Directions to Graders 16

b. Report by Question Leader:
Dean Gerhard Friedrich. 18

Six Sample Student Papers. 21

2. Question 2. 27

a. Directions to Graders 28

b. Report by Question Leader:
Dr. Rex Burbank 31

Six Sample Student Papers. 34

IV. The Norm Sample 40

a. San Jose State. 41

b. Stanford University 42

c. University of California, Riverside 43

d. University of California, Santa Barbara 44

e. University of California, Los Angeles 45

f. University of California Combined 46

V. Conclusions and Follow-Up Studies 49

VI. Appendix V

A. Statisticians' Report:
Mr. Robert Bradley and Mr. John Bianchini. . . . VII

B. 1973 - 74 Budget XXI

C. Score Distribution Tables. XXIII

D. Intercorrelation Tables. XXXV

PREFACE

The development and implementation of the 1973 California State Universities and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination has been fully detailed in Comparison and Contrast, Office of the Chancellor, California State Universities and Colleges, 1974. Since the 1974 examination was, in most respects, a repeat of the 1973 examination, the following report should be taken as a supplement to the earlier volume. In almost every respect, procedures followed those of the previous year, and the same personnel were involved in the same capacities. Thus, this report goes into detail only when new problems or solutions occurred.

I

SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET

The 1974 English Equivalency Examination took place without most of the problems that went into the innovative 1973 program. The vexing theoretical issues, the dark suspicions, and the practical testing decisions generally had been resolved by the 1973 administration; in most quarters, general assumptions of good faith, academic integrity, and professional competence generated approval without much question.

The test was given May 11, 1974 to 3,639 students, of whom 1,036 passed. Once again, it consisted of a 90-minute essay test constructed and graded by California State Universities and Colleges English faculty, and the 90-minute objective CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature. The carefully controlled essay reading conducted June 15 - 19 by 45 English professors drawn from all 19 CSUC campuses once again produced highly accurate test scores at relatively modest cost.

The principle of essay testing for freshman English course equivalency may now be considered well-established within the CSUC system; the method of creating and grading the essay tests has become highly sophisticated and highly reliable. (Stanford University and Southern University, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, for example, sent "participant-observers" to the 1974 reading to learn

from our practice.) Although elsewhere in the nation English faculties are too frequently frustrated by objective tests chosen and scored by non-professionals, this issue has been resolved in our system. With continued vigilance and care, English faculty should remain in overall charge of freshman English equivalency testing which includes student writing.

Finally, funding has been made available for full follow-up studies, now under way. About 80% of the 4,071 students who took the 1973 test enrolled on CSUC campuses in 1973-74, and a large amount of data is being collected by Dr. Leon Thomas, Associate Dean, Institutional Research, in the Chancellor's Office. Analysis of this data should give definitive answers to the questions a large-scale testing program raises, in particular to the question of how the students gaining credit differ in their course plans and grades from those not gaining credit.

1974 ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAMINATION FACT SHEET

Test Date:	May 11, 1974
Test Used:	CLEP Subject Examination, Analysis and Interpretation of Literature (90-minutes) in combination with Two 45-minute essay questions prepared by CSUC English faculty (90-minutes)
Number of Candidates:	3,639
Number Passed:	1,036
Percentage Passed:	28.5%
Number of Semester Credit Units Earned:	6,216
Scoring Data:	
Minimum Passing Scores:	
Objective Part:	45 (CLEP scale) (achieved by 69.3%)
Essay Part:	13 (out of a possible 24 points; equivalent to 53 on the CLEP scale.) (achieved by 38.8%)
Combined Score:	105 (49 objective + 56 essay, each on the CLEP scale.) (54.4% achieved 49 or better on the objective test, and 27.3% achieved 56 or better on the essay test)
Mean and Standard Deviation:	
Objective Part:	
Mean:	49.444
Standard Deviation:	9.001

Essay Part:

Mean:	48.620
Standard Deviation:	9.171

Combined Score:

Mean:	98.064
Standard Deviation:	15.855

Statistical Data:

Correlation between CSUC Essay and CLEP Objective Tests:	.5225
Reliability:	
CLEP Test:	.88
Essay Reading:	.83

Essay Reading:

Number of Readers:	49 including 4 guest readers
Number of Colleges Represented:	All 19 CSUC Campuses plus UCLA, UCSB, Stanford, and Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA.
Grading Scale:	6 point
Number of Readings per Test:	4 (2 independent readings for each question; additional readings to reconcile discrepant grades)
Total Essay Readings:	Approximately 20,000
Weighting and Scaling:	The essay score was converted by the equipercentile method to the CLEP scale (20-80), and the scores on both parts of the examination were added. Each part received equal weight.

II

ADMINISTRATION OF THE TEST

Once again, the CSUC English Council designated Dr. Edward M. White, California State College, San Bernardino, and Dr. Richard W. Lid, California State University, Northridge, as directors of the test program; they performed in the same capacities as they did in 1973.

Coordination of test administration again took place through the test office of California State University, Long Beach under the direction of Dr. Rick Cantey. A new test manual was prepared by Ms. Betsy Barlow of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, and the administration of the test went smoothly.

It seemed clear in the follow-up reports by Test Officers that one problem mentioned frequently by them in 1973 (that is, the difficulty of giving the test for an hour and a half before lunch, with an hour break for lunch, and an hour and a half of additional testing after lunch) remained a problem on two counts. In the first place, proctors still expect to be paid for a full day of work rather than a half day since, in essence, that time arrangement does take up a proctor's full day. Secondly, a fair number of students continued to show up for one part or the other of the examination, perhaps thinking that the same examination was being given at two separate times. The test officers recommend that the 1975 test be given starting at 8:00 AM so that it clearly takes up only half a day of student and proctor time; there is some evidence

to suggest that the students might do just as well without the lunch break before writing their essays. In any event, this is a change to be considered for the administration of the 1975 test.

A more severe problem had to do with reporting of test scores from the Educational Testing Service. In brief, it was very difficult to get an accurate and useable report from Princeton of the objective test scores in time for the essay test reading. There were many reasons for this problem, the most important of which were located in the ETS offices in Princeton. In 1975, it might make better sense to have all processing of test materials take place through the Berkeley office of ETS, so as to eliminate the need for cross-country communications.

The most important change from the 1973 procedures in administering the test had to do with the computerization of test results. One weak spot, perhaps the major weak spot in the administration of the 1973 examination, occurred at the point of recording test scores and data about the test applicants. In 1974, we sought to improve this. In the first place, we asked for additional data about the test applicants to be recorded on their application forms; and in the second place, we had the test scores entered on keypunch cards so that the addition, conversion, and other manipulations of test scores could be done by computer instead of by hand.

The application form for the examination was changed to include data that we sought to accumulate in 1973 through post card and other follow-up methods (see Table I). Of particular

TABLE I

Registration Form

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

1974 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY TEST

(in cooperation with the College-Level Examination Program)

1. NAME (Print your last, first, and middle names in these spaces.) — LAST NAME — FIRST NAME — MIDDLE NAME

2. SIGNATURE — (Write name in usual manner as if signing a business letter.)

3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

4. SEX — Male 1 ☐ Female 2 ☐

5. DATE of BIRTH — MONTH, DAY, YEAR

6. HEIGHT — ft. in.

7. WEIGHT — LBS.

8. EYES — COLOR

9. HAIR — COLOR

10. DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER — AREA, EXT.

11. ADDRESS at WHICH YOU WANT TO RECEIVE YOUR SCORE REPORT (Make sure this address is one where a score would normally appear) — YOUR NUMBER AND STREET (Apartment or Fraternity) — YOUR CITY AND STATE (Postal Zone Number) — ZIP CODE

12. Do not fill in — 0 0 0 0 — CSU ENGLISH TEST CENTER

13. EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
1 ☐ H.S. Student
2 ☐ College Freshman
3 ☐ College Sophomore
4 ☐ College Junior
5 ☐ College Senior
6 ☐ Other

14. NOTE: In submitting this form the candidate agrees to have his name included on the list of those who have passed and sent to the California State University and Colleges.

15. TEST CENTER (See List of Test Centers on back page) — CENTER NUMBER — INSTITUTION — CITY — STATE — ZIP CODE

16. TEST DATE: May 11, 1974

17. SUBJECT EXAM: Analysis and Interpretation of Literature

18. FEES AND REMITTANCE: Enclose with this registration form a $15 check or money order payable to COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD. Do not send cash.

19. SCHOOL NOW ATTENDING: _____ CITY _____

20. EDUCATIONAL PLAN FOR FALL 1974
☐ None Campus _____ Prospective Major _____

IMPORTANT:
1. Registration cannot be accepted without the test fee.
2. Cut along dotted lines and send this form and the fee (no cash or stamps) to the test officer at the college or university center where you wish to take the test.
3. Registration must be received at the test center by April 19, 1974.

interest to the high schools is the item calling for the school that the student is now attending; the various high schools are deeply interested in the results their candidates achieve on this test. This material has been coded on computerized tape in Princeton and will become part of the master file in machine readable form kept by Institutional Research at the Chancellor's Office.

The computerization of test results was a very complicated procedure. The most important development which led to this advance in our procedures came from the appointment of Mr. Robert Bradley, Chief Test Officer, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, as the Chief Statistical Consultant for the project. Mr. Bradley was able to supervise the computerization of the test results and, through his good offices, the project was able to use the services of the Computer Center at Cal Poly, Pomona and its very capable Computer Programmer, Mr. Dan Rozboril. Mr. Rozboril constructed the program that was necessary, and Mr. Jim Kilroy, Director of the Cal Poly Computer Center, arranged for keypunch operators and computer time during the course of the essay reading. In brief, the test booklets, with the four separate test scores recorded clearly on the front, were sent to the Computer Center. Keypunch operators then prepared a deck of cards with the student's name, social security number, and the four separate essay scores. This material was then combined by the computer with the material that

had arrived from Princeton containing name, social security number, and objective test score. The computer combined the two separate banks of information, added the four separate essay scores, converted the essay score total according to the conversion table that Mr. Bradley established during the course of the reading, added the converted essay score to the objective test score to produce a composite score, and then identified by asterisks those students who had passed the test according to the criteria developed in the post-essay reading conference. The extraordinary success of the operation allowed us to have most of the notifications of test results in the mail to the students within 48 hours of the end of the essay test reading. (See Appendix II for Mr. Bradley's Statistical Report and for details of the computer programming.)

Another aspect of the 1974 test that differed from the 1973 administration was the way in which norm samples were collected. In 1974, instead of attempting to collect a representative group of papers from all 19 State Universities, an attempt which was quite unsuccessful in 1973 (See Comparison and Contrast, pp. 51-58), we attempted to gather a fairly complete norm sample from one typical campus, San Jose State University. Mr. Will Crockett, Director of Composition at San Jose State University, sought to obtain essay test papers written by all San Jose freshmen students completing a year's

work of English. Chapter IV details the results of this norm sample, which once again proved to be unreliable in several important respects. In addition, a substantial sample of student papers from the University of California system was collected and read, with results as detailed in Chapter IV below. The participation by the University of California this year was noticeably more enthusiastic and more full than the previous year, and the participation of two readers supported by and representing the University of California at the essay reading tends to support the argument that the University of California will eventually decide to join our test program. It is hard to forsee what this prospective participation by the University of California will mean to the test program in the future, but this increased participation in 1974 was interesting and helpful.

It is hard to understand why fewer students took the test in 1974 than did in 1973. Two possible explanations have presented themselves. One is the reduced amount of publicity for the test program. In 1973 the test program was an innovation, and as such received a fair amount of newspaper and radio publicity, and the test, hence, came to the attention of many people who may not have been aware that such a program existed. In 1974, there was almost no newspaper publicity, despite a series of press releases, and numbers of students who may have been able to take advantage of

the test might not have discovered its existence. We also continued to find it difficult to get the application forms into the hands of high school students by way of high school counselors. The press releases sent to high school newspapers may or may not have been printed in those newspapers; we have no evidence to show, in fact, that they were used. One change we expect to make in 1975 is to insure that test application and information forms do, in fact, reach high school principals and the chairmen of high school English departments, and perhaps more students will find out about the test in 1975 than did in 1974.

A second explanation for the reduced number of students who took the test assumes that as many prospective students found out about the test this year as last, but that the announced pass rate in 1973 of approximately one-third discouraged weaker students from applying to take the test. This argument is supported by the results of the objective test, which showed fewer scores at the very bottom and a rise in the mean score of two points. Perhaps a combination of these two explanations provides an answer for the lower number of enrollees for credit. If the University of California agrees to participate in the test administration and grading in 1975, it seems likely that additional publicity is likely to take place and a larger pool of applicants for credit--perhaps significantly larger--will appear to take the 1975

examination. Otherwise, it would seem unrealistic to expect more than about 4,000 students statewide to show up to take the test in 1975.

The objective test chosen by the English Council this year, upon recommendation of its test committee (chaired by Lennis Dunlap, Chairman, English Department, California State University, Chico), was a different form of the same test used in 1973. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on English Testing to the English Council was unanimously approved at the Fall 1973 meeting, and follows in its entirety in Table II.

Despite the improved objective test scores, the pass rate dropped from 33.5 in 1973 to 28.5 in 1974. The lower pass rate in 1974 poses some interesting problems. We had expected that the higher mean score on the objective examination would lead to a higher pass rate, but this did not turn out to be the case. Essay test scores ran significantly lower in 1974 than they did in 1973. The combination of lower essay scores and higher objective scores resulted in a different conversion table. (Appendix B compares the conversion table of 1973 with that of 1974, and explains why the conversion table, in fact, changed.)
There are several explanations for the lower essay scores. There is some evidence that the readers were harder in 1974 than they were in 1973. The score distribution table shows very few high scores

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH TESTING TO THE ENGLISH COUNCIL

The ad hoc Committee on English Equivalency Testing unanimously recommends that the English Council continue the supervision and administration of the English Equivalency Test.

The Committee further recommends the continuation of the present two-part structure of the examination: an essay component and an objective component.

The Committee further recommends that the choice of essay topics be left to the discretion of the committee charged with administering the examination and that the use of the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature be retained as the objective instrument.

Following a question-by-question analysis of this instrument and the Freshman English Test, a possible alternative, the Committee recommends continued use of the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature for the following reasons:

1. The Analysis and Interpretation of Literature has a unity of focus that the Freshman English Test conspicuously lacks.

2. Although a literature test, the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature calls for appropriately close textual reading rather than for specific information about a body of literature.

3. The Analysis and Interpretation of Literature contains fewer disputed items than does the Freshman English Test, i.e., questions that gave rise to objections by members of the Committee.

4. The range and variety of items makes the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature a truly representative literature examination.

5. The Analysis and Interpretation of Literature admirably complements the essay portion of the examination.

6. The inclusion of a literature component in the examination encourages the teaching of literature in the high schools.

7. The Analysis and Interpretation of Literature is a suitably rigorous examination.

8. The experience of the first year shows that the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature works for our student population: it discriminates at all levels and produces a good spread of scores.

9. As a test of literature, the Analysis and Interpretation of Literature seems fairer than an essay test on literature.

10. The Analysis and Interpretation of Literature is psychometrically sound.

The Committee recommends the official reappointment of those who administered the Examination this year. They are willing to serve; and can bring valuable experience to the job.

The Committee further recommends that the practice of awarding a six-unit block of credit to students who pass the examination be continued and that pressures to award partial credit for passing one component be strongly resisted.

Finally, the Committee recommends that the English Council call upon the Chancellor to provide full funding for the administration of the Examination, as well as for the continued study and evaluation of the Examination.

FOR THE COMMITTEE: Lennis Dunlap
Lennis Dunlap, Chairman

and a tendency to score in the middle range. It is possible that the scoring was, in fact, harder than the previous year, although the fact that the same question leaders and table leaders were used makes this an unlikely possibility. More probable is the fact that the essay questions themselves were harder in 1974 than 1973 and that the students found it more difficult to do well. The first essay question, which in 1973 was based on a description of an object, in 1974 was based on a description of an experience. The results bear out the common sense prediction that it is harder to describe an experience than it is to describe an object, and thus it was simply harder to do well on essay 1 this year because of that fact. Again, essay 2, which in 1973 called for a discussion of materialism and the use of objects, in 1974 called for a discussion of the concept of justice; once again, it is clearly more difficult to write well about justice than than it is to write well about materialism. If this second argument is, in fact, the case, it points to one of the problems remaining in this test program: that is, the problem of essay test development. The development of the essay questions is described below and it was done carefully in 1974; however, it is the intention of the directors of the project to give more thought, more attention, and more money to the development of essay questions in 1975 in order to produce an essay test which will allow students of high ability to demonstrate their high ability better than they appear to have been able to in 1974.

III

THE ESSAY TEST

The following California State University and Colleges English professors met on March 15, 1974 to create the essay examination: Rex Burbank (San Jose), Wilbert Crockett (San Jose), James Frey (Fresno), Gerhard Friedrich (CSUC, State University and College Dean), Robert Hodgman (Los Angeles), William Leary (Los Angeles), Richard Lid (Northridge), William Robinson (San Francisco), Richard Suter (Pomona), Henry Van Slooten (Northridge), and Edward White (San Bernardino).

The same kinds of questions that were used in 1973 were sought: question one would test the student's ability to describe an experience and his capacity to move from description to abstraction, while question two would ask for comparison and contrast of two short passages in order to examine the student's ability to respond incisively to others' ideas.

1. Question 1. The following question was distributed to all students:

"Think of a personal experience that has in some way changed your life, either for better or worse: a particular event, a person, a place you have visited, a book you have read. Describe the experience in detail and explain fully why it was an important one for you."

The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of question 1:

"The student is asked to write about a personal experience that has in some way changed his life, either for better or worse: a particular event, a person, a place, a book. He is specifically asked to 1) describe the experience in detail, and 2) explain fully why it was an important one. The student should be rewarded for what he does well in his response to the assignment. Papers should be scored for their overall quality.

"An extremely well-written response may be scored a point higher than it would on the basis of content alone.

"A poorly written response may be scored a point lower.

"Errors in spelling and punctuation which occur in writing a draft under examination conditions should not ordinarily be counted against the score.

"NOTE: Since the student is asked to write about a personal experience and its importance to him, a wide range of individual choices and attitudes must be allowed for. Answers should therefore not be penalized simply because the writer may regard even his most important experience as relatively insignificant, because he seeks to provide a philosophical perspective, or because he views the experience in humorous or satirical fashion. Imaginative responses should be recognized and rewarded, as distinct from 'cop-outs.'

"Possible Scores:

6 A superior response will be a well-organized essay that does the two things asked for in the assignment. It will describe an experience in sufficient detail to make it distinctive, and it will explain the importance of the experience. An essay getting a score of six will show a high degree of competence generally, though it may have minor imperfections.

5-4 These scores apply to responses that deal with the two tasks specified in the assignment less thoroughly than the essays scoring 6. The description may be somewhat general or abstract, and the explanation more implicit than explicit. However, essays in this group should have an effective,

logical order and be reasonably free from errors in the conventions of writing.

3-2 Papers in this category respond only partially to the assignment. They may:

--give adequate attention to one of the specified tasks but little to the other;

--treat both tasks rather superficially;

--be lacking in supporting detail;

--drift away from the topic or display considerable irrelevancy;

--have serious faults in writing.

1 This score should be given to any response that is on the topic but suggests incompetence.

* Non-response papers and papers that are completely off the topic should be given to the table leader."

The following report was prepared by Dean Gerhard Friedrich, question leader for the first question:

SUMMARY REPORT ON QUESTION #1

The second annual administration of the California State University and Colleges English Equivalency Test again employed a ninety-minute composition portion consisting of two distinct writing tasks. The first essay question was again deliberately open-ended, permitting the candidates essentially to write on a subject of his or her choice; the second essay question was again more structured, requiring the candidate to deal with a given subject and with certain

aspects of the subject.

A planning meeting called by the co-directors considered a variety of suggested test questions. Two potential versions of Essay Question #1 and Essay Question #2 were thus selected for pretesting and carefully rewritten. Pretest responses from students in comparable California State University and College classes were reviewed to determine the suitability of the proposed topics for testing purposes and particularly the adequacy of the instructions. As a result of this analysis, a somewhat modified version of one of the pretested alternatives for Essay Question #1 was developed for actual use by candidates seeking equivalency credit.

After the candidates' essay booklets had been received from the test centers, the two question leaders read a large number of responses and selected sample essays illustrating the range of performances to be identified, from excellent to incompetent. On a 6-point scale, the scores of 6, 5 and 4 were used to indicate degrees of creditable performance, and the scores of 3, 2 and 1, degrees of deficiency in terms of college-level compositions. In order to aid table leaders and readers in achieving and maintaining comparability of standards, each question leader prepared a "Key to Scoring" based largely on Advanced Placement English models.

The readers of the candidates' compositions were again drawn from among the English faculties of the nineteen campuses in the California State University and Colleges, with a sprinkling of representatives from other institutions in California and elsewhere. Readers were divided into groups of six or seven, each with an experienced table leader. The table leaders for each question were brought together in a pre-reading session to harmonize grading standards on the basis of a representative sample of papers previously selected. Subsequently, they similarly instructed their respective readers. Consistency of standards was further ensured by having the table leaders regularly double-check scores assigned by readers; readers were also encouraged to confer with their table leaders on any scoring problems. Question leaders in turn double-checked the scores assigned by table leaders, and from time to time throughout the reading polled the entire group on additional sample papers. The careful selection of readers--approximately two-thirds experienced and one-third new--appears to have contributed significantly to the ease with which a workable consensus was established. In the relatively few instances in which scores assigned to a Question #1 response were two or more

points apart, the essay received a third reading. Whenever scoring discrepancies involved the same two readers, they were requested to reread the essays in question, to discuss their apparent differences, and to make appropriate adjustments. This approach minimized possible critical implications and served as a self-corrective.

Readers took the task of assigning appropriate scores seriously, and they managed to read far more essays per day than the previous year, but with some increased evidence of wear and tear. The candidates exhibited a wide range of compositional abilities, from brilliant to illiterate, and in most instances the readers of the same composition assigned identical scores.

It should be noted that this year's Essay Question #1 was apparently harder than last year's, and that it produced fewer scores of 6. Last year's question dealt with the value of an object; this year's, with the importance of a personal experience. Readers were reminded of this difference and its implications by the following NOTE:

> "Since the student is asked to write about a personal experience and its importance to him, a wide range of individual choices and attitudes must be allowed for. Answers should therefore not be penalized simply because the writer may regard even his most important experience as relatively insignificant, because he seeks to provide a philosophical perspective, or because he views the experience in humorous or satirical fashion. Imaginative responses should be recognized and rewarded, as distinct from 'cop-outs.'"

In general, the 1974 Essay Question #1, and the arrangements made in connection with it, proved to work very well.

Gerhard Friedrich
June 18, 1974

The following student responses to Question #1 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

"I was becoming rather pessimistic in my view of life in general; Because of the injusticies, corruption, lies, and hypocracy I saw almost in everyone; in school etc. Until I started to think why many of these things were, what circumstances brought them about, and I realized that life is pretty much what you make it. From pessimism I came to believe that everyone wanted to be good but they weren't sure how to do it.

"This change in my way of thirking didn't come all at once. It come by gradual perceptions of human behavior; such as why a person should become nervous in a certain situation, or why some people seemed to understand better than others. This experience was brought about mainly by a combination of several events that helped me to think more clearly; and I think another major factor was an atmosphere at home and school of calmness.

"The importance of this revelation or understand is manifold. It has shown me a new way of learning to live in this society. I have noticed several times that it has saved me from doing foolish things. I have become more at ease with myself. Frustration doesn't bother me mentally, make me upset; it may make me mad but I understand how to deal with it. In general it has made me a better person, enlightened my life, given me an ambition to live my life the best I can and to be proud of it.

SCORE OF TWO

"A persistantly used topic in novels and films is that of the 'art student' in a garret in Europe. Humble, naive, and left out of the mainstream of culture and society, he spends his days mooning through plaza and cathedral. Typically he subsists on a meager income gleaned from selling a small painting or two. Such a romantic existance was the antithesis of my sojourn in Firenze, Italy.

"Caught helplessly in a rush from private school to villa, and back, I was a captive of a widowed teacher bent on spending a small grant for the luxury of touring Italy in a new Mercedes-Benz. Culture was deprived from my visual perusal by the constant onslaught of theatre engagements and expensive restaraunts. No, I could not

boast of an increased understanding of Verrochio, but only of the finest wines and meats.

"Such a fictional account must be the meat of many an essay dealing with milestones in life. Yet I regret to say that I am not able to paint such a lurid tapestry, if only because most of my life is yet ahead of me. I find that when faced with the challenge of recognizing a major catalyst in my existance, I am unable to do so because of several important considerations.

"For some event to be meaningful in the necessary contest, surely its aftermath must be multi-decodous in length. At 18, and aware of only the last half of my duration to date, I lack the required insight to appreciate such a remarkable, if not violent, motive force. Oh, I could speculate to the hearts content, but this method falls short of reality.

"To guess at the probably longterm outcome of anything short of death or grevious injury is grossly unwise. Understand that any predictions of the future are always clouded by optimism, or perhaps pesimism, but rarely the correct confluence at the hands of the adolescent writer.

"In short, careful retrospect and insightful analysis can not be taken from a medium that has not, as yet, had ample opportunity to mellow with experience. One can not stand at the mouth of many tunnels and know what dragons lurk within. Only with the eventual outcome of the drama can I afford to rest and then comprehend the reasons for the structure of the plot. Such a report may indeed be forthcoming in future years.

"As a note to the preceding piece, it is not meant to be acid but rather the only reply imaginable to me, in light of the nature of the question. Perhaps I interpret the meaning too gravely."

SCORE OF THREE

"There has been one person in my life that has changed me very significently. This person, who's name is Leslie, makes me realize just what kind of an individual I am. Before I met her, I had a variety of problems. One very drastic problem that I had was the lack of self-confidence. There was no self-motivation behind me what so ever, and it showed very much. I also had another very serious problem which was the constant thought of death. The idea that we will not <u>be</u> any more or more specifically that <u>I</u> will not be any more was running through my mind at all times. Still another problem that troubled me was an inferior attitude towards myself. This attitude was not only mental, but in my physical features and abilities also. I was constantly believing that I

was very ugly inside and outside, and this feeling developed into deep stages of depression. Depression was so much a part of me that others did not want to be around me. Then I met this person and started talking out each problem with her. She explained to me the seriousness of my problems and allowed me to solve them for myself, just by talking. Leslie said that if I had no confidence in myself, who would have confidence in me? She also showed me how fun and exciting life could be to the point where I no longer had to think about death. By this time, depression seemed one of the farthest possibilities for me.

"Because of Leslie, I am now a changed person. She made life worth living for me, and most of all, she allowed me to understand it all. Now I realize that I am a changed individual. An individual different and unique from all other persons, with attributes that are unique also. This realization has been very important to me. Everything was against me before Leslie helped me understand all of this, but now I have a lot to learn and experience. Now I am even starting to understand and help other people with their problems. This also is very important to me. It raises my self esteem to know that I can be of help or service to another individual in need.

"To some people the importance of life is not realized unless they find out they are going to die. By this I mean someone who finds out they have a terminal disease. Then, the whole world changes before their very eyes. Each day is lived to it's fullest; like it was the last day of their lives. Everything becomes beautiful and simple. Leslie made me realize that I don't have to think of life as a terminal illness. By understanding myself better, I can live each day with enthusiasm just like it was the last day of my life.

"This feeling alone that have described explains the importance of Leslie being a very significant change in my life."

SCORE OF FOUR

"When I was approximately ten years old, I joined a synchronized swimming team called the San Francisco Merionettes. I heard about the team from a friend of mine who's sister had been on the team for about five years. For the first few years we trained on Tuesdays and Saturdays from 5 p.m. until 7 p.m. As the years went by and I advanced within the team I began to train more often during the week--three days, four days, five, six, and finally seven days a week. The club was divided into smaller teams ranging from the "A" team (the best) down to about the "G" or "H" team. It took me seven years to reach the "A" team but it was well worth all of the time and effort spent to reach this goal. As a member of the Amateur Athletic Union I competed in many meets here in San Francisco and also in other cities throughout the Bay Area. My coach,

Marion Kane; was known as one of the best in the business so I frequently placed in the top three and received medals for my accomplishments. I also made many lasting friendships not only with the girls on my team who I trained so often with but also with girls from other teams who I competed against. Though the competition was tough there was always a friendly atmosphere at the swim meets and it was a good chance to make new friends from other cities. For some meets we would travel to other states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas to compete. This was usually a National Meet where girls from all over the United States met to compete in the sport of synchronized swimming. National meets occur twice a year; usually in April and in July. Synchronized swimming is different from speed swimming because you swim to music in a team of eight, a duet of two, or a solo routine. The routines take from three to five minutes each and are prepared and practiced for months ahead. When your routine is completed you are judged by seven judges on a scale from one to ten and, when the scores are calculated, you are ranked from first on down. The competition was sometimes very close which made it exciting and suspenseful when the medals were being awarded. The travel was always exciting and fun and it was a good chance to see new and different places. In the summer of 1973 a team of ten girls from our team toured Europe for three weeks to help the European teams and also to do demonstrations. I was included in this team and had a very fun and interesting trip. Now, our coach has retired so I no longer swim, but I have the friends and the memories from the seven-year experience. Swimming was a very big part of my life during those years. I enjoyed the daily exercise and the idea of getting out and working with a group headed towards a major goal rather than eating and watching television every day after school. I feel the discipline did me alot of good, also, physically as well as mentally. I feel I am a much more rounded person from all of the travel and the meeting of people from different areas. All in all, my membership in the Merionettes had a lot to do with the person that I am today and I am very glad that my young friend got me interested in the team. I got alot out of it by putting alot into it and I feel that if I had it to do over, I certainly would.

SCORE OF FIVE

"'Oh - Amerika!' I remember her face scrubbed clean in the sub-zero air like an old apple someone had picked up and polished. Her eyes sparkled against the snowy forest as she looked up at me, bent now but still so alive.

"We were walking through the snow drifts to the chapel; I was nineteen, she was ninety-three; and we were both just a little suspicious of why the other was there, the Russian border only ten miles away.
"Of course, she had more reason to be there than I. She was Russian. It showed in the way she tilted her hat to the right, as all Cossacks did before the revolution struck; it showed in her thick, gnarled hands that helped in the fields for ninety years before she decided to slow down and just work in the barn; and it showed in her eyes as she looked at me then.
"'Amerika.'
"What could I tell her? How could I tell her why I had come? Was Russia as different as we were told it was? Russia, now the USSR and 'Amerika,' now the U.S.--were they that different? Was there some kind of mutation in the human race that made our ideologies so diametrically opposed?
"I looked at the wizened, ancient woman as if she could give me an answer, but I spoke only Finnish and my companions teeth had either fallen out or served her so badly that I could barely understand her as she spoke. She smelled of the barn. Of green hay and warm milk and geraniums-in-the-window, in an old patched coat that seemed to bury her--but not her eyes. She was looking past the forest at the sun as it began to rise and bathe the sky in velvet;
"'It's beautiful,' I said as my eyes followed hers.
"'Herosheni,' She said.
"'What?' She smiled at my question.
"'I am too old, and my Finnish is very bad, but it makes no difference. Everytime we see the sun rise, I will say 'Herosheni,' and you will say whatever it is you say in Amerika, and it will make no difference. We will be as one.' She smiled as she walked ahead of me.
"'Herosheni.'
"I have never found a dictionary that could define that word."

SCORE OF SIX

"Sometimes, people are not able to mature properly; others get a head start early in life. A trip I went on to Canada with my father at age eleven changed my whole outlook on life, from that of a frolicking boy to a serious young man.
"We had gone mountainclimbing for several years, and our experience was extensive. My father and I both belonged to the Sierra Club, and had participated in many of its' events together. But we had grown tired of climbing in the High Sierras. We wanted to climb

in another country, on an expedition. At one particular club meeting, we picked up a brochure put out by Mountain Travel, an expedition organizing corporation. We read through it, and found a trip to Canada to our liking. The first requirement, we learned, was to send resumés of yourself and your experience. Needless to say, the expedition leader was astonished at my amount of experience in the mountains, on all types of terrain. My age cast some doubt on my eligibility, but the amount of experience I had compiled more than made up for it. After several months of planning, buying, assembling, and packing, we were ready to go. The first stage was to fly to Vancouver. Everything from then on was left to the organization and its' leaders.

"We left Vancouver in an Amphibious aircraft headed for Mimpo Lake. This was to be our base, from where we were to attempt to explore the Monarch Icecap region of British Columbia, and conquer several of its glorious peaks. Every other day it rained, so we did not get much done for the first week or so. The leader, Gary, was not much to my father's liking. He was a very immature man of about thirty. We attempted two or three minor peaks, with him leading, and he would just walk off and leave the group to catch up or get lost. His wife was on the expedition also, and once, when we stopped at the base of a large glacier to put on crampons, he just left his wife behind, still struggling with her crampon straps.

"My father was not pleased with our leader's conduct; to say the least, he was furious. There we were, 200 miles from the nearest city, fifty miles from a farm or cow pasture, and we were stuck for two more weeks with a man who might walk off and leave his own wife to die. My father did not like the situation, and the friction between him and Gary increased. The other members of the expedition were also aware of Gary's immaturity, but what could we do?

"One night, in our tent, my father and I decided we were going to leave on our own. We were not having any fun, and we were being herded about like cattle by the leader. We packed up everything we would need, and, at about midnight, we set of down the glacier towards Bella Coola, where we could get a plane home. Walking in the dark, with only starlight to guide us, we worked our way through the maze of glaciers that could swallow a man before he could shout. The deep crevasses all around, some 300 feet or more to the bottom, loomed toward us like hugh abyssas. In the light of early dawn, we were almost down off the glacier when my father slipped and broke his ankles. I was horror stricken! What could we do, out in the middle of a glacier, my father who could not walk and myself, an eleven year old boy. We worked to erect a sort of shelter, my father directing and me lifting or tugging. When he was safe and

warm, I set off alone, back toward camp to get the others to come and help us.
"It took me a day and one-half to get back and get help, winding my way around gigantic crevasses, over huge snowbridges that threatened to give way beneath me, over cliffs so slimy my boots would not stay put. It was a miracle I got back alive. I enlisted the help of the other climbers, and we used the camp radio to call a helicopter to get my father and I back to civilization.
"I think this event in my life was an important one because it changed my whole outlook towards people, especially adults. It made me realize that there are dumb, incompetent people at every age level, and that people like my father were very extradinary indeed. I had previously thought that all adults were like my father; calm, mature, collected, not like little children. That talk with my father the night we left camp was very enlightening. He showed me how Gary had been a very mean, immature man, self-centered and unreliable. I came to realize that many people never really grow up, but die as immature as young children.
"I also learned to take on the responsibilities of an adult. I saw what had to be done, and I faced the crisis head on, instead of crying or turning away from it. I feel that all the temporary grief this incident caused was nothing compared to the changes in my character that were brought about by this calamity."

2. Question 2. The following question was distributed to all students:

A. "'If a society is to strive with any hope of success toward peace and prosperity in a commonwealth, the authority governing that society must not only be able to pass laws and to reassess those laws constantly as circumstances change. . ., it must also be enabled to enforce those laws and to exact penalties for their violation.'

B. "'Under a government that imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also in prison.'

"Assignment: Write an essay on the two passages above in which you answer the following:
In what ways are these statements alike and in what ways do they differ?
What strong or weak points does each position have?
To what extent might a person accept both positions?"

The following directions for scoring were distributed to all readers engaged in the grading of question 2:

"The student is asked to write an essay in which he explains 1) in what ways the two statements are alike and in what ways they differ; 2) what strong or weak points each position has; and 3) to what extent a person might accept both positions. He should be rewarded for what he does well in his response to the assigment. Papers should be scored for their overall quality.

"An extremely well-written response may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone.

"A poorly written response may be scored a point lower.

"Spelling errors should not ordinarily be counted against the score.

"Possible Scores:

6 A superior response will be a well-organized essay that does the three things asked for in the assignment. It will compare and contrast the meanings of the two statements. It may explain the meanings by means of comparison and contrast, or it may explain the meanings and compare and contrast them. The best essays will note that while the quotations both say something about government and laws, the first asserts the need for law and order and takes the point of view of the state, while the second affirms the principle of justice as superior to the laws of the state when those laws are unjust, and it is written

from the perspective of the individual. The best essays will show consciousness of the possible dangers inherent to the first quotation (that is, that it could mean that even unjust laws should be enforced, that it says nothing about individual rights, that it emphasizes punishment and authority rather than freedom); and the most perceptive may perceive dangers in an uncompromising position on the second passage. The best papers may show an awareness that the two positions, properly qualified, can both be accepted. An essay getting a score of six will show a high degree of competence generally, though it may have minor imperfections.

5-4 These scores apply to responses that concentrate more on one quotation than the other, or that deal with both subjects somewhat less thoroughly than the essays scoring 6. Essays in this group may have minor errors in writing.

3-2 Papers in this category deal with both quotations but may:

--be lacking in supporting details, or treat both quotations superficially;

--give adequate attention to one but too little to the other;

--fail to see that both are concerned with laws and the state but that there are important differences between them;

--misunderstand or misinterpret the meaning of either or both;

--be <u>primarily</u> critical or argumentative;

--have serious faults in writing;

--drift away from the topics or display considerable irrelevancy.

1 This score should be given to any response that is on the topic but suggests incompetence.

* Non-response papers and papers that are completely off the topic should be given to the table leader."

The following report was prepared by Dr. Rex Burbank, question leader for Question #2:

SUMMARY REPORT ON QUESTION #2

The two essay questions were devised by subcommittees at our first meeting in April. Question 2 was designed to suggest an organizing principle upon which the examinee could build a 45-minute essay. Two quotations were used, and students were asked, first, to tell how the meanings were alike and how they differed, second, to specify strong and weak points in each, and third, to indicate how it might be possible to accept some aspects of both positions. The structure suggested was thus based upon explanation or definition, comparison, and contrast.

Having decided upon the question, the subcommittee arranged with Dr. Lid to have it pretested by a group of freshman English students at California State University, Northridge, under his direction. The subcommittee developed a scoring key that set forth agreed-upon standards for grading the pretest samples. A second pretesting, following slight revisions in the assignment, was done at San Jose State University.

When the pretest papers came to me, I read and scored them in accordance with the key and compared the essay scores with the grades given those freshman students on the first two essays assigned in their course. There was enough of a correlation between scores and grades to suggest that the question would generate essays by high school seniors that could be scored meaningfully on a 6-point scale.

In the first week in June, following administration of the test, Dr. Lid's office sent me Xerox copies of 75 test papers, which I read and gleaned for samples, of which I found 27. The samples were copied and sent to each of the four table leaders assigned to work on the reading of Question 2. The table leaders were asked to score the samples according to the scoring key.

On Saturday morning, June 14, Dean Friedrich and I met separately with the table leaders assigned to us. We went through each sample, scoring it and discussing the scores in relation to the test papers in order to arrive at agreement as to what qualities or weaknesses would be found in responses at all points on the 6-point scale. By noon, the table leaders were in close agreement on their scoring which, done without prior discussion, was within a point of mine in most cases.

In the afternoon, the readers met with table leaders and repeated the scoring of 8 samples as we had done in the morning. All the table leaders and most of the readers were experienced in this type of reading, so the 'training session' went well enough for us to begin the actual reading of 'live' test booklets at 3:00 PM. We continued the next morning but not until after four more samples had been read did we resume reading 'live' ones. Always, the readers were told, the goal was uniformity in scoring: every student taking the test, we emphasized, had a right to feel that his test was being scored in the same way and by the same standards as everyone else's. Readers were asked, again, to sacrifice their own grading policies and standards for those established by the scoring key and by the group as a whole. In nearly all cases, readers understood the need to do this and cooperated.

Samples were passed out periodically for the remainder of the readings. All together, about 50 samples were scored. Readers scored them and their scores were compared with those agreed upon by the table leaders and me. The readers were asked to adjust their scoring in accordance with the samples. In addition to sampling, checking was done by having table leaders gather papers at random from those already read and scored by readers at their table, scoring the papers themselves, and recording both their own scores and those of the readers on a 'check sheet.' The table leaders (who read and scored papers without seeing the scores given by the readers) brought the checklist with the test booklets to me, and I then read and scored them myself without looking at the scores given by the table leaders and their respective readers. Thus I was able continually to check the scoring of the readers with that of the table leaders and both against my own. Where trends developed at some tables -- such as the tendency to grade too high or too low or to settle in the 3-4 range -- they could be and were corrected by passing out samples representing the full range of scores in order to remind the readers again to use the full scale and get clearly in mind once more the qualities of papers at each point in the scale. A high degree of agreement was achieved, and in the vast majority of cases the two readings of Question 2 were within one point of each other. When there was a spread of two points a response was read a third time by an individual in a special group of our best readers chosen for this task. Papers (and there were remarkably few) with a spread of 3 points were given at least two additional readings. Most papers with a spread of 3 points were radically uneven in quality and so the discrepancies were understandable. I'm satisfied, however, that generally the papers were graded with a very high degree of uniformity, reliability, and validity.

We didn't expect perfection from even the best of the student responses, but for a score of 6 we required that the paper show a high degree of writing skill in doing what was asked by the assignment. The essay was expected to say something, directly or indirectly, about the meanings of the quotations and compare and contrast them. The best papers were expected to demonstrate the ability to build on the implied organization with meaningful details, to develop the general points the writer made, and show a high degree of understanding of the quotations. The best papers, for instance, revealed a consciousness that the first quotation emphasized the interests of the state, while the second emphasized those of the individual; the first stressed law and order, the second, conscience. Students writing the best papers accurately perceived one or more such distinctions.

A paper given a score of 5 fell just short of the 6 essay in having minor faults in writing, being slightly less well developed, or displaying a slightly less acute understanding of one of the quotations; or emphasizing one quotation over the other. A paper given a 4 differed only in degree from those given a 5; it was awarded a 4 rather than a 3 in that, overall, it suggested competence, despite whatever minor faults it might have, rather than incompetence.

We asked the readers to decide first of all, as they read, whether the paper was an upper or a lower half (that is, a 6-5-4 or a 3-2-1) essay, to look at the quality of the paper as a whole, first, and then to make the necessary distinctions within those two categories. We asked them to forget the letter-grading they are used to in their own teaching and to remind themselves that it was essential to use <u>both</u> ends of the scale as well as the middle; only then could we make relative judgements and pertinent distinctions.

Papers given a 3 grade were lacking in details, or gave <u>too</u> <u>little</u> attention to one of the quotations, or failed to perceive similarities in the quotations, were primarily critical rather than explanatory, lacked unity, or had serious faults in writing. A 2 paper had one or more of these weaknesses in greater degree than one given a 3. A paper was to be given a 1 if it was on the topic but was so badly written that it suggested illiteracy or clear incompetence. We gave a 0 to off-topic essays or papers with no response at all. Examples of papers given scores 1 to 6 are appended to this report, as are the forms used in the readings.

Rex Burbank
June 19, 1974

The following student responses to Question #2 were sample papers used during the reading to illustrate the grades on the 6-point scale:

SCORE OF ONE

"These statements have little in common except that they both talk of justice and penalties within society. "A" speaks of keeping up with the times while "B" speaks of justice for those accused of violating laws.
"Both have something important to say, and deliver it with a certain amount of impact. I say "B" has much more impact than "A", because it's statement is made with one short (down to the bone) sentence, stripping it to the raw unclutter point! Which "A" trips out on "If society is to strive--blabber--;" "A" gives an introduction to its statement which I feel isn't necessary, leaving me with the feeling that its more story than statement.
"I would accept both positions to any extent. B is a little extream in its message but thats what gives it its impact. While "A"s position is one of a lot of peoples, I'm sure. Its a safe general statement of fitting penalties to the present day society. They are both reasonable, and complement eachother nicely."

SCORE OF TWO

"The two passages are quite different from each other. Although they are both of the opinionated form, the second is much more poetic than the first. The first one states a warning or a set of instructions on which one might form a constitution. The second, on the other hand, gives a form of philosophy.
"The first one is quite explicite in that it sets the goals and what must be done to meet them. I says that peace and prosperity are what you're striving for and the only way is through flexability in government.
"The second is harder to understand. It says that if you live under a government that imprisons unjustly, a just man should be in prison. I find this hard to agree with. I feel if a just man lives under such a government he should strive to make it just. Another thing which is hard to take is that if all the just men were in prison only the unjust would be left to govern.
"A person might accept both positions if he understood the the second is pretty dangerous."

SCORE OF THREE

"The two questions are similar in that they deal with the just way to strive for justice in government. Laws are provided that hopefully nobody who is innocent of a crime can be puniched. This creates a situation that enables many criminals to escape justice. By the second questions standards it is better that a few guilty people are protected so that innocent people are protected also. There must be sufficient evidence to support guilt, leaving no doubt in the judge or jurie's minds of guilt or innocence.

"The question arises of what is just or unjust. Who is allowed to set standards for society. Some argue that the majority rules in all cases leaving no allowance for any other possibilities. In many cases however the majority will be the same people and the minority will never be heard from, thus getting the shaft.

"In other cases it is the ellect officials which we the public elect into office who create justice, and all that laws are followed. These people however are squeezed into tight limitations because of our Constitution, leaving no possibility for personal involvement in any case.

"The Constitution creates another loophole in that it creates different powers, and leaves Congress open to decide what is meant by parts of the Constitution. They can interpret it a number of ways, changing it for individual cases.

"A major weakness in the first statement is that it does not set limitations on law enforcement. There is a limit to how much power any one particular organization should have and ones own individual rights as written in the "Bill of Rights." Where does law enrorcement end and 1984 begin. Do we want a police state, with no regard for personal freedom. If this were to occur the second question could likely be draft, with both just and unjust persons being the victims.

"At the same time total anarchy with no rules or regulations would create total chaos, with everybody attempting to beat out his competitor. In creating laws you try to establish what will be the best good for the most amount of people, without leaving any individual out.

"The system we live in creates a sense of competition, in which money is the eventual end goal. In many cases people are placed into roles of superior inferior, with the inferior having to prove himself to rise to the higher plateau. There are often obstacles which obstruct and impede this persons progress, which results in extreme measures by that individual to survive in society. He is left little option but to committ a crime under governmental laws. Is it fair that this person was put into the situation where there

was no alternative. Does 'fairness,' even enter into the picture as a possible motivating factor. That is a question which is often dealt with, but with no satisfactory answer for everyone. The question arises of everybody having equal opportunity in our society, but is that always the case or is that a non-reality.

"The first question makes the statement, 'reassess those laws constantly as circumstances change,' which outwardly seems fine. Everything no matter what it is should be open to change, but is that change occuring fast enough. In many cases the statement is made that we are changing, but we can't do everything overnight. Is this an exaggeration by these people or are they justified in this comment. In some cases they do change, but in others they don't, but not everybody wants these changes to occur, so on the whole it would seen successful, but what about the time lag between a proposed change and the actual writing of it into law. In many cases it becomes obsolete, and has a negative reaction by all.

"It is hard to please everybody, but the major thing which should be strived for is justice, even in one form or another, making a strong attempt to please everybody."

SCORE OF FOUR

"Statement one, taken for itself, has many strong points but it is not entirely without fault. In any orderly society, there must be laws, and they must be enforced, so as to insure greater peace and protection for all. However, law must be not so terribly strict as to imprison a man unjustly. The justice of these laws must be considered in their reassessing, but, even then, a law should not be totally rigid.

"Statement two, dealing with unjust imprisonment, also has strong and weak points. If a man is imprisoned unjustly, it should not be taken as an indictment against the whole system. It is true, however, that a law should be able to be considered differently in different situations. When just men see others imprisoned unjustly, their place should not be 'in prison' with the first, but out trying to do something about the unjustness.

"In many ways, the statements' basic messages can be both accepted by a person. However, qualifications must be made and neither statement should be accepted as it is. Laws are necessary in society, if it is to flourish, and they must not be ignored. However, in their enforcement, the justness or unjustness to the individual must be equally considered. The key to the reconciling of these two viewpoints is found in this sentence from statement one: authority must 'reassess laws constantly as circumstances change.' If the law

is reassessed according to different and changing situations and times, then it also must be considered differently in situations involving different individuals. In this way, it will be insured that laws, while being enforced, are not unjust in their imprisonment of persons."

SCORE OF FIVE

"Statements A and B have both strong and weak points. They are similar in some ways, but different in others. It is actually possible for a person to accept both positions.

"Statement A is basically sound government policy. It is true that a society should be able to pass laws and reassess those laws. As times change, the attitudes and needs of the citizens change, and the duty of the legislature is to meet those needs with progressive legislation. A society should also be able to enforce its laws and punish violators. With no executive branch to support the legislature, a society quickly becomes anarchy. Punishment must be administered to violators to rehabilitate them, deter other possible criminals, and protect society from dangerous individuals. These are all strong points of Statement A. However, statement A does not mention any guarantee of personal rights to the citizens. To insure a democratic society, a constitution outlining these basic rights is a necessity. Without this basic framework, an oppressive government could result.

"Statement B, on the other hand, says that in a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also in prison. The strength of this statement lies in the principle of justice, where no innocent man can be punished for something he did not do. This statement is weak by not offering any solution or system whereby a government could operate efficiently and not risk persecuting the innocent.

"Statement A appears to be written from the viewpoint of the head of society, while statement B seems to express the average citizens views. In this way the statements differ. They are alike in that they are both opinions on how a society should operate.

"It is not difficult to accept both statements. Obviously, the men who set up our government took both points of view into consideration. Our legislature operates under a basic constitution and continually makes new laws to keep up with our changing society. Our judiciary uses a system whereby a fair trial is guaranteed and those convicted of crimes are punished. We also have policemen to enforce the law and protect society from criminals. It is impossible to have a system where all criminals are punished and no innocent people also

go to jail. It is equally impossible to not persecute any just men, and still efficiently punish criminals. A good society should have a golden nean, as ours has, where the rights of the individual are protected and criminals are still punished.
"We have seen that the two statements offer opposing views of a perfect society, and that both have their strong points and weak points. By adopting the strong points of each, it is possible to accept both statements to a large extent, much as our society has."

SCORE OF SIX

"Statements A and B differ greatly, primarily in their respective outlook upon Society in general. The first Statement is undoubtedly that of a political realist, dealing only in the black-and-white of the extent of governmental authority. The second is obviously the profession of a political moralist, to whom authority is useless if misdirected. In the 4th Century B.C. a Chinese philosopher named K'ung Fu-tzu, better known as Confucius, stated that government exists for the benefit of the governed, and not visa-versa. Hence, while a government may possess power, it must also dispense justice fairly.
"Examine each statement carefully for while both are well-founded, both contain damaging, perhaps damning contradictions of thought. The author of the first can be thought of as being guilty only of political realism and skepticism. All he has done was to put bluntly what every nation's political philosophy has stated indirectly since time immemorial. An ordered state is desirable, therefore laws must be made. If laws are to be made their violators must be punished. This is all simple political philosophy, with all conclusions resting on the basic premise of national survival. Had the author of this statement rested his personal argument upon 'national survival', there would be little to dispute. However, his supposed aim was 'peace and prosperity in a commonwealth.' Under these circumstances, his statement is found to be inadequate. While bills of attainder are suitable for rational survival, genuine peace and prosperity requires a judicial check upon legislative authority, a means by which justice can be dispensed in the commonwealth. Note that such a reference is non-existant. The exacting of penalties is left to the governing authority. This authority reaches omnipotency in that it exists and operates without the interaction with any independent power (as a check).
"In the second statement a verbal profession of the ideas of Gandhi is seen. Indeed, it is nothing but a restatement of the noble theory that led many Indians to perform acts of civil disobedience (resulting in imprisonment) in order to call attention to widespread injustice.

Yet, if a government is so lacking in justice, civil disobedience or non-violent publicity-getting is not adequate. If we are to believe the Confucian concept of government to benefit the governed, then we can conclude, as did the master's student, Mencius, that the people have the right to change their form of government, by whatever means are endemic to that nation's beliefs. Therefore, we see that the just man's confinement (by his own design) to prison, defeats the just man's purpose in an unjustly governed society.
"Although the two statements seem to be different, a man can, with clear conscience, subscribe to both. An omnipotent governmental authority can indeed bring 'peace and prosperity', as long as harsh laws are tempered with even justice, so that a just man need not feel his true place to be in prison."

IV

THE NORM SAMPLE

The following charts show the performance level of college students who wrote the essay examination. All of these students, with the exception of the advanced group from the Stanford Writing Workshop, were completing a one-year course in freshman English.

The norm groups all confirm the validity of the essay test. In all cases, mean scores of statistically significant groups with higher course grades achieved higher test scores. It seems very likely that the essay test is, as one would expect, examining the skills that go into the determination of course grades in freshman English.

Nonetheless, the generally low test scores achieved by passing college students raise a series of troubling questions. Perhaps, despite all of our efforts, the college students were not performing at the level of their true ability; they probably did not have the very high motivation of the test group, which was self-selected, had paid $15.00 to take the test, and had the possibility of gaining six units of college credit. The San Jose norm group, in particular, was drawn from a course normally not taken by English majors, and hence may be presumed to be skewed low in writing ability.

Despite these, and other objections to the representativeness of the norm samples, we must acknowledge the similar performance

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

SAN JOSE STATE

GROUP	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	29	13.07	3.03
B	100	12.31	2.76
C	99	10.39	2.47
D	27	9.00	2.82
F	7	9.57	1.30
A+B	129	12.48	2.84
C+D+F	133	10.07	2.57
A+B+C	228	11.57	2.88
D+F	34	9.12	2.60
Group As A Whole	262	11.2557	2.96

N =10 sections, average enrollment 26.2, English 1B, designed for non-English majors.

TABLE 4

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

STANFORD

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	7	16.57	1.99
B	8	14.25	3.19
C	5	13.00	1.67
D	1	14.00	0
F	0		
A+B	15	15.33	2.94
A+B+C	20	14.75	2.86
C+D	6	13.17	1.57
Group	21	14.71	2.80

N = selected writing workshop, all class levels.

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

U C R

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	27	13.22	2.77
B	46	12.28	2.85
C	12	11.75	1.59
D	2	9.5	.5
F	0		
A+B	73	12.63	2.85
A+B+C	85	12.51	2.73
C+D	14	11.43	1.68
Group	87	12.44	2.74

N = 4 sections, English 1B, designed for non-English majors.

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

U C S B

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	4	15.5	2.29
B	14	14.43	2.32
C	10	13.10	1.87
D	5	11.6	1.50
F	1	6	0
A+B	18	14.67	2.36
A+B+C	28	14.11	2.32
C+D+F	16	12.19	2.43
D+F	6	10.67	2.49
Group	34	13.50	2.69

N = 2 sections, English 1B, Designed for non-English majors.

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

U C L A

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	6	16.0	1.29
B	11	12.73	2.99
C	6	10.5	1.50
D	0		
F	0		
A+B	17	13.88	2.97
A+B+C	23	13.00	3.05
Group	23	13.00	3.05

N = 1 section, English 1B, designed for non-English majors.

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COMBINED

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	37	13.92	2.78
B	71	12.77	2.90
C	28	11.96	1.94
D	7	11.00	1.60
F	1	6.00	0
A+B	108	13.17	2.91
A+B+C	136	12.92	2.78
C+D+F	36	11.61	2.11
D+F	8	10.38	2.23
Group	144	12.78	2.81

level of this years' norm group to last years'--which we declared to be unrepresentative on other grounds. In 1975, we must again select a norm group, and bend every effort to make it demonstrably representative; if, once again, the college norm group obtains low scores, at least some of the following observations will be inescapable:

1) Students are passing college freshman English, many of them with high grades, who either cannot or will not perform at the minimum passing level of the English Equivalency Examination.

2) While it is reasonable and fair to expect applicants for credit to achieve a high passing score on the test, in order to avoid awarding college credit to marginal students on the basis of a few hours of work, it is <u>not</u> reasonable and fair to set the passing score higher than the mean score of college B students--if we may rely on the grades reported to the project.

3) If, on the other hand, we declare the examination results to be more reliable and professional than course grades, and we reject the normative value of course grades--a procedure many of those involved in the test project would endorse--, then we must proceed to question what we expect to accomplish and are accomplishing in our freshman English courses and what our grading system means in these courses. It appears that we are expecting so little by way of writing ability at the end of freshman English that we give failing scores to most of our

passing students when we don't know whose writing we are scoring.

4) If we are in fact grading our students in our courses far too easily, we may thereby be losing the only justification for freshman English. That is, if a passing, or even a high grade does not mean the student can write passably, can we really claim that we have taught our students much about writing? If not, then perhaps a higher grading standard, closer to that which we use when grading the English Equivalency Examination, might preserve our claims for the course, even if such standards disagree with current fashions and trends in higher education.

While it is possible that the 1975 norm sample will at last show our college students performing well on the examination, and thus let us put aside these problems, it is far more likely that we will need to face the grim curricular implications of our test.

V

CONCLUSIONS AND FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

A major study of the academic performance of students taking the English Equivalency Examination is now under way. Some 80% of the 4,071 students who took the examination in 1973 were enrolled on a California State Universities and Colleges campus in the 1973 - 74 academic year; their records are being collected and converted to machine-readable form by Associate Dean of Institutional Research Leon Thomas in the Chancellor's Office. Dean Thomas' memo summarizes some of the questions this study may answer:

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90036

IR 74-25

REPLY REQUESTED BY
AUGUST 19, 1974

Date: July 31, 1974

To: Directors of Institutional Research

From: Leon L. Thomas
Associate Dean
Institutional Research

Subject: English Equivalency Examination - Follow-Up Studies

3,094 of those taking the Spring 1973 English Equivalency Examination were identified as enrolled in The California State University and Colleges during the Fall 1973 term. Table I shows the distribution of those enrolled.

The EEE project has requested assistance of this and the campus offices of Institutional Research in the evaluation of this innovative project. More specifically, the project has asked for our help in the collection and analysis of follow-up data on those EEE participants who were CSUC students during the 1973-74 academic year.

Among the questions to be answered by these follow-up studies are:[1]

1. Will the students use the 6 units gained by the examination to abbreviate their college career or rather to advance the level of their studies?

2. Will students receiving credit for freshman English by examination avoid further English courses or rather be encouraged to take more advanced courses?

3. Will students who receive credit for freshman English by examination achieve as well in advanced courses requiring writing as students with approximately equal ability who took the freshman English course?

4. Do students with the particular skills and abilities to pass this kind of test tend to go to or come from certain schools or certain programs?

5. To what degree is success on this sort of examination dependent upon race, economic level, or other extra-academic factors?

Much of the data required for these studies can and will be obtained centrally, e.g. ERS II. Certain of the data, however, can only be obtained from local campus records. Your assistance in collecting these data, consisting primarily of first-year academic performance information, is requested. To facilitate this process a set of data collection forms is attached - one form for each EEE participant enrolled on your campus. Each form gives the student's name, social security number and the title of each data item required. A sample form showing the desired format when completed is also included.

If your campus can more easily provide the required data in some alternate form, e.g. via machine processing, the alternative is, of course, acceptable.

Realizing that collecting these data may tax limited resources, the EEE project is making funds available to help defray your costs to the extent of $0.50 per completed student record. These funds may be used in any manner your campus deems efficient, as long as their use is documented and justifiable. (Billing mechanics will be detailed in a subsequent memorandum).

Your timely and continued cooperation in this evaluation is anticipated since the results will be important, not only to the EEE project, but to the continuing development of policies and practices for credit by examination in other disciplines.

LLT:cb

Attachments

[1]White, Edward M. Comparison and Contrast - The 1973 California State University and Colleges Freshman English Equivalency Examination: Office of the Chancellor, The California State University and Colleges, Los Angeles, October 1973.

Table 1

EEE Participants Enrolled at CSUC Campuses
Fall, 1973

Campus	Enrolled		Passed		Pass./Enr.	Expt. Passers+	
	No.	%	No.	%	%	No.	%
Bakersfield	55	1.8	21	2.0	38.2	19	1.9
Chico	221	7.1	73	7.0	33.0	72	7.1
Domingues Hills	33	1.1	6	0.6	18.2	6	0.6
Fresno	86	2.8	32	3.1	37.2	30	2.9
Fullerton	312	10.1	114	10.9	36.5	108	10.6
Hayward	118	3.8	44	4.2	37.3	44	4.3
Humboldt	255	8.2	99	9.5	38.8	99	9.7
Long Beach	207	6.7	70	6.7	33.8	68	6.7
Los Angeles	68	2.2	21	2.0	30.9	17	1.7
Northridge	272	8.8	79	7.6	29.0	82	8.0
Pomona	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sacramento	138	4.5	42	4.0	30.4	40	3.9
San Bernardino	31	1.0	8	0.8	25.8	6	0.6
San Diego	344	11.1	111	10.6	32.3	110	10.8
San Francisco	217	7.0	79	7.6	36.4	76	7.5
San Jose	275	8.9	92	8.8	33.5	85	8.3
San Luis Obispo	333	10.8	104	10.0	31.2	105	10.3
Sonoma	96	3.1	40	3.8	41.7	43	4.2
Stanislaus	33	1.1	10	1.0	30.3	10	1.0
All Campuses*	3094	100.0	1045	100.0	33.8	1020	100.0

*Except Pomona

+Source: Postcard responses from those passing

CSUC - Institutional Research
March 1974

Distribution: Vice President, Academic Affairs w/o attachments
Test Officers " "
Registrars " "
Chairmen, Departments of English " "
Chancellor's Staff " "

However, this test program raises other and larger questions than those Dean Thomas cites. These questions have to do with the function of equivalency testing for General Education credits, the ways in which we teach, or claim to teach writing, and the place of writing within the undergraduate curriculum.

The only conclusions possible at this point are two: the English Equivalency Examination appears to be accomplishing its goal, and is likely to force upon the faculties, the Chancellor's Office, and the Legislature consideration of the important questions it raises.

VI

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

English Equivalency Test, May 1974

STATISTICAL REPORT

January, 1975

Robert Bradley
John Bianchini

I. The Test.

The second administration of the California State University English Equivalency Test was conducted on Saturday, May 11, 1974.1 The test has two ninety-minute sections; the first is an objective, multiple choice part, and the second is an essay part with two questions. The objective section consists of the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" Subject Examination of the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). The two questions of the essay section were developed and scored by the English professors of the California State University and Colleges.

II. Scores.

(1) Objective Score. The objective part of the test was scored by the Educational Testing Service, and scores were reported on the CLEP Subject Examination scale, which ranges from 20 to 80.

(2) Essay Reading Scores. Each of the two essay questions was graded by two readers, and scores were given on a scale of 1 to 6. For a single reading of a question, a score of 4 or higher represented a passing performance. A zero indicated that the student did not attempt to answer the question.

(3) Essay Question Score. The scores for the first and second reading of each question were combined to produce a question score, which ranges from 0 to 12.

(4) Raw Essay Total Score. The two question scores were added to produce a raw essay total score. This score falls between the limits of 0 and 24. Scores of 0 and 2 occurred only if one or both questions were not attempted.

(5) Converted Essay Scores. The raw essay total scores were transformed to the same scale as the objective scores to permit the addition of objective and essay scores in a meaningful way.

(6) Composite Score. The objective score and the converted essay score for each person were added to produce a composite score. Since both objective and converted essay scores are expressed on a 20 to 80 scale, the composite scores range from 40 to 160.

---

1. See Cowell, William, The California State University English Equivalency Test, May 1973. Statistical Report SR-74-10, Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, February 1974. The writers of this report have followed the format developed by Mr. Cowell.

III. Candidate Groups and Norms Samples.

(1) Total Group. The total group consists of the 3,623 students who took both sections of the English Equivalency Test. The objective part of the test was taken by 3,639 students, but sixteen of these students failed to take the essay part of the examination.

(2) Equating Sample. The first 523 essay papers scored at the reading session comprise the equating sample. All of the essay books were systematically scrambled prior to the reading to insure that they would be read in an essentially random order. The equating sample is assumed to be representative of the total group, inasmuch as the means and standard deviations of the objective scores of both groups are within acceptable limits as shown below.

	Objective Scores	
	Mean	S. D.
Total Group	49.44	9.00
Equating Sample	49.94	9.04

The data from the equating sample were used to equate the essay scores to the objective scores, and to obtain correlations and other relevant statistics which were used to monitor the standards set for the reading of the essays.

(3) CLEP Norms Sample. This group consists of 541 college students who participated in the 1964 norming administration of the CLEP Analysis and Interpretation of Literature examination.

(4) Texas Norms Sample. This sample consists of the 188 students included in the 1970 validity study of the CLEP examination at the University of Texas. Scores on the CLEP test were related to final grades in relevant courses.

(5) CSUC Norms Sample. The essay questions of the English Equivalency Test were administered to a sample of 262 CSUC students who were completing a year of standard English composition. These essay papers, indistinguishable from regular papers, were interspersed with the candidate essays and scored during the reading session. The average essay scores for students who earned various letter grades in the English composition courses were determined, and the information was used to help establish the minimum passing score for the essay part of the examination. The information for the CSUC norms sample is summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

GROUP	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	29	13.07	3.03
B	100	12.31	2.76
C	99	10.39	2.47
D	27	9.00	2.82
F	7	9.57	1.30
A+B	129	12.48	2.84
A+B+C	228	11.57	2.88
C+D+F	133	10.07	2.57
D+F	34	9.12	2.60
Group As A Whole	262	11.2557	2.96

(6) UC Norms Sample. The essay part of the test was also administered to 144 students completing a year of English at three campuses of the University of California. These essays were also interspersed with the candidates' papers and scored during the reading session. Essay scores were compared with course grades, and these data also contributed to the decision on the minimum passing score for the essay part. The UC data are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COMBINED

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	37	13.92	2.78
B	71	12.77	2.90
C	28	11.96	1.94
D	7	11.00	1.60
F	1	6.00	0
A+B	108	13.17	2.91
A+B+C	136	12.92	2.78
C+D+F	36	11.61	2.11
D+F	8	10.38	2.23
Group	144	12.78	2.81

(7) Stanford Norms Sample. A small number of students enrolled in a creative writing class at Stanford University took the essay part of the exam, and these essays were also scored during the reading session. The data relating essay scores to course grades are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4

ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY EXAM, 1974

NORM SAMPLE

STANFORD

	N	MEAN	Standard Deviation
A	7	16.57	1.99
B	8	14.25	3.19
C	5	13.00	1.67
D	1	14.00	0
F	0		
A+B	15	15.33	2.94
A+B+C	20	14.75	2.86
C+D	6	13.17	1.57
Group	21	14.71	2.80

IV. The Equating Procedure.

Scores which are expressed on different scales cannot be combined without giving a greater weight to the scores on the scale which has the largest range of numerical values. The raw essay total score scale extends from 0 to 24, while the objective score scale extends from 20 to 80. If scores from these different scales were combined, the objective score would influence the composite score about three times as much as would the raw essay score. A solution to this problem is found by transforming the units of one of the scales so they are numerically equivalent to those of the other scale. This transformation can be performed so that the "equated scale units" represent equal increments in relative position on each of the score scales. Since the objective scores were reported on the CLEP scale, the essay scores were transformed to the CLEP scale by means of the equipercentile method of equating. In so doing, a given converted score represents the same percentile rank on both the essay score distribution and the objective score distribution. In other words, equal converted scores on the two parts of the English Equivalency Test represent the same level of performance on each part.

V. Technical Notes on Equating.

(1) Two basic methods of equating are available, and when the score distributions are very similar in shape, these methods yield almost identical results. Given similar score distributions, the linear method, which sets equal scores to equal standard-score deviates, is preferable. The linear method is completely analytical (determined by a mathematical relationship) and is free from judgments of curve smoothing.[2] However, if the two score distributions differ in shape, the linear method fails to adjust for this difference.

Thus, when the distributions have different shapes, or when the shape of one or both distributions is not known or cannot be accurately predicted, the curvilinear or equipercentile method is to be preferred. If the two score distributions differ in shape, the equipercentile method will stretch or compress the score scale of the distribution being converted to fit the shape of the other distribution. This method defines equal scores as those scores which represent the same percentile rank on both distributions. Using the score conversion table (Table 5) for illustration, a raw essay score of 14 corresponds to a converted score of 56. The percent of students scoring below 14 on the raw essay scale is the same as the percent scoring below 56 on the objective scale. Thus, in the sense that the two scores represent the same relative rank (percentile) within their distributions, they are equivalent scores.

---

2. Angoff, W. H. "Scales, Norms, and Equivalent Scores" in R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd ed., Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 562-565.

TABLE 5

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

CSUC ENGLISH EQUIVALENCY TEST

May, 1974

Essay Total Score	Converted Score
24	79
23	77
22	75
21	73
20	71
19	69
18	66
17	63
16	61
15	59
14	56
13	53
12	50
11	46
10	42
9	39
8	36
7	33
6	30
5	27
4	25
3	23
2	22
1	21
0	20

(2) Percentile rank values for each point on the objective score scale were plotted on normal probability graph paper. These points were connected by a smoothed curve, and for the points on the curve corresponding to the percentile rank of each raw essay score the objective score equivalent was determined.[3]

---

3. Ibid., pp. 516, 571.

(3) If the two score distributions differ in shape, the use of the equipercentile equating method, as noted above, will modify the essay raw score scale by altering the relative distances of some scores from the median. This modification of the raw score scale will result in a less-than-perfect correlation between raw scores and converted scores. The correlation between raw essay and converted essay scores for the English Equivalency Test was .995, which indicates a near-perfect degree of linear relationship between the raw essay score scale and the CLEP scale. In other words, the shape of the raw score distribution so closely approximated that of the objective score distribution that the linear method of equating could have been used instead of the equipercentile method.

VI. Passing Scores.

(1) Basic Passing Scores. An examinee was required to achieve a certain score on both the essay and objective parts of the examination in order to pass. These passing scores were added to arrive at a minimum composite passing score. Data from the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample were used to establish the passing score for the objective part. Since for both of these samples the average CLEP score for C students was 49, a score of 49 was set as the passing requirement on the objective part.

For the essay part of the examination, a score of 4 represented acceptable performance for a given essay reading. The criteria by which a reader was to distinquish between acceptable (4 or higher) and unacceptable (3 or lower) performance were carefully delineated in training sessions prior to the reading, and were emphasized by table and question leaders during the course of the reading. These criteria represented a consensus among leading State University English professors. Each essay paper had two questions which were given two readings each, for a total of four reading scores. A score of 16 (on the 0 to 24 essay total score scale) thus represents an average score of 4 on each of the four readings. However, inspection of the frequency distribution of essay total scores shows that only 11.5% scored 16 or higher, indicating that 16 would be a very rigorous passing score.

Conversely, an essay score of 12 means that the average reading score was 3, or that on the average not one of the four readers found the performance on either of the two questions to be acceptable. A compromise was reached with a raw score of 14, which means that on the average two of the four readers judged the performance to be acceptable. The basic passing score on the essay part of the exam was therefore set at 14.

The data from the norms samples shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4 were evaluated in an attempt to set an appropriate and defensible passing score for the essay part of the examination. The basic premise was that the essay passing score should be at least as high as the average essay score of students who earned grades of C in freshman English in the California State University norms sample. Although the testing of the CSUC norms sample was carefully planned and conducted to elicit adequate motivation, the results were viewed with at least a modicum of skepticism. It could well be argued that a more appropriate passing score would be the average score achieved by all students who earned a C or higher (A+B+C),

or the average score achieved by B students, or even that achieved by A and B students combined. The average essay scores achieved by these various groups were: C students 10.4; A+B+C students 11.6; B students 12.3; and A+B students 12.5. From the University of California norms sample, it was noted that A students averaged 13.9, while the A and B students combined average 13.2.

From the above normative data, it is apparent that a passing score of 14 represents a high level of competence relative to the performance of students in freshman English classes at both the California State University and colleges and the University of California. The decision to set the passing score at 14 represented a consensus among the project directors, question leaders, and consulting statisticians that the heaviest weight should be given to carefully developed performance standards rather than performance levels as reflected by norms sample grades.

(2) Compensation Model. Following the 1973 procedure, a limited amount of compensation between essay and objective scores was permitted. That is, one of the scores could drop below the passing level if the other score was sufficiently high. Since the basic objective passing score was set at 49, and that of the essay was set at 14 (converted to 56), the minimum composite passing score was set at 105 (49 + 56). The limits within which compensation would operate were then determined by defining scores for both parts which represented absolute minima, below which no compensation could be justified. The objective minimum was set at 45, because this score minimized the number of A, B, and C students who would fail and the number of D and F students who would pass in both the CLEP norms sample and the Texas norms sample.

The essay minimum score was set at 13, which means that at least one reader gave a satisfactory rating on one of the two essays. However, for a candidate to pass on the strength of only one acceptable reading, it had to be accompanied by an objective score of 55 or higher, resulting in a composite score of at least 108. (In the CLEP norms sample, 55 was the average score of B students who had completed a year of study in literature, and represented the 65th percentile rank on the score distribution.)

The limits of compensation, then, were as follows: essay scores of 13, which convert to 53, required an objective score of at least 55 with the resulting composite score of 108 or greater; objective scores of 45 called for an essay score of at least 16 (which converts to 61) in order to yield the required minimum composite of 105, and objective scores of 46, 47, and 48 required an essay score of 15 (which converts to 59) to yield a composite of at least 105.

VII. Pass Rates.

(1) Objective, Essay, and Total Pass Rates. A total of 3,623 students took both parts of the English Equivalency Test. Those who passed the exam qualified to receive six semester units of credit in freshman English. The numbers and percentages of students who passed each part and of those who passed the total exam are summarized below.

TABLE 6

	Objective Test		Essay		Total Exam			
					Without Compensation		With Compensation	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
PASS	1970	54.4	988	27.3	820	22.6	1036	28.6
NO PASS	1653	45.6	2635	72.7	2803	77.4	2587	71.4

It is apparent from these data that a score of 14 on the essay represents a more difficult passing criterion than a score of 49 on the objective part. Accordingly, very few students (4.7% of the total group) with passing essay scores failed to pass the objective test. Conversely, a large number of students (27.1% of the total group) who passed the objective test failed on the essay.

(2) The Effect of Compensation. The effect of the compensatory model was to raise the total pass rate from 22.6% to 28.6%. Thus, the compensation criteria allowed 166 students with essay scores of 13 and objective scores of 55 or higher to pass the examination. In addition, 50 students with objective scores between 45 and 48 inclusive and essay scores of 15 or higher were also allowed to pass.

(3) The "13" Essay Score. In 1973, the "13" essay score was subject to the same compensatory criterion as the "below 49" objective score; that is, in both cases the same composite score of 100 was required to pass the examination.[4] This year, however, the committee members decided to adopt a more stringent policy for the "13" essay score than for the "below 49" objective score; see Section VI, 2, above.

A total of 416 students, or 11.5% of the total group, earned a score of 13 on the essay. If a composite score of 105 had been used as with the "below 49" objective score, 51.9% of these students would have passed the examination. By requiring a composite score of 108, 39.9% of these students passed, thus reducing by 12% the passing percentage of the students with essay scores of 13.

VIII. Technical Notes on Differences Between 1973 and 1974 Data.

(1) Changes in Mean Objective Scores. The CLEP score scale functions as an anchor which permits the comparison of performance on different administrations of the test. The average objective score in 1974 (49.44) was nearly two points higher on the CLEP scale than the average score for 1973 (47.45). The 1974 candidates may have been better grounded in principles

4. Cowell, W., op. cit., pp. 4, 5.

of literary interpretation, but in addition they were probably a more capable group in terms of general academic aptitude, which contributes significantly to performance on tests of this type.

(2) Changes in Converted Score Equivalents. The 1974 data yielded consistently higher converted score equivalents for essay scores than were obtained in 1973. For example, in the critical pass/fail range, essay scores of 13 and 14 are equivalent to CLEP scores of 53 and 56 respectively in 1974, while the same essay scores were equivalent to CLEP scores of 48 and 51 in 1973. The higher equivalent scores for the 1974 essay scores suggest an increased level of difficulty in the 1974 essay questions, possibly confounded with a higher grading standard in 1974.

IX. Correlations Between Readings and Between Questions.

The correlation between the scores for the first and second readings of Question 1 was .59, and for Question 2 was .66. These figures represent the reliability of the grading procedure, and are discussed in the section on reliability. The scores for the first reading of Question 1 correlated .28 with the scores for the first reading of Question 2. Likewise, the scores for the second reading of both questions correlated .28.

When the two reading scores for each question are combined, the correlation between the questions scores is .35. This figure represents the degree of relationship between the two essay questions. Since the proportion of shared variance is indicated by the square of the correlation, only 12½% of the variance in each question is shared with the other. This suggests that the two questions are drawing upon essentially different types of writing ability.

It should be noted that the unreliability of the grading, as reflected in the correlations between readings, obscures some of the underlying relationship between the domains represented by the two questions. An estimate of this underlying relationship between the questions can be obtained by removing the effect of the unreliability in the grading procedure. When the influence of grading unreliability is extracted from both questions by a procedure called "correction for attenuation,"[5] the estimated relationship between the questions is .45. The correction for grading unreliability increases the proportion of shared variance to only 20½%, which tends to confirm the inference that the two questions represent different domains of content, and sample different facets of writing ability which are presumably developed in English Composition classes.

X. Correlations Between Parts.

Correlations among the objective, raw essay total, and converted essay scores were computed for the total group. The objective and converted essay scores correlated .52, which is about optimal for an examination of this kind. If the relationship were lower it would be difficult to justify

---

5. Magnusson, D. Test Theory, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967, pp. 147-149.

the compensation which is allowed by combining the scores to form a composite. A substantially higher correlation would mean that each part overlapped the other to the extent that the use of both parts would be redundant.

The correlation of .995 between the raw and converted essay scores indicated a strong linear relationship between the scores. As noted above (section V, 3), this high degree of linearity means that the two score distributions are virtually identical in shape, and the linear equating method could have been used.

XI. Reliability.

(1) Reliability of the Objective Part. The reliability of the CLEP "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination is .88, as reported in the CLEP Score Interpretation Guide.[6]

(2) Reliability of the Essay Part. Because essay tests generally consist of only one or at most several items, it is not possible to compute reliability by "split-half" or "internal consistency" methods. The only alternative is "form-to-form" reliability, which entails giving two equivalent forms of a test to the same group of students. Ideally, a random half of the group would take one test first, and the remaining half would take the other test first. However, the preparation of an equivalent form for a one-or-two question test would be an extremely difficult task, because one or two questions do not represent an adequate or representative sample from the domain of content. In lieu of a formal method of computing reliability, a method of estimation is used. Upper and lower limits of reliability can be established, with the certainty that the actual value lies somewhere between the two limits.

(3) The Upper Limit. The correlation between grades on the first and second readings of each essay question represents the reliability of the grading procedure. Since unreliability due to grading is only one of several sources of error variance, the value for grading reliability will always be higher than the overall reliability value which includes all sources of error variance. Thus grading reliability can be used as the upper limit of overall or actual reliability. For Question 1, the correlation between grades on both readings is .59, and for Question 2 the correlation is .66. These values are the reliabilities of a single reading. That is, the reliability of each reading of Question 1 is .59. Adding the reading scores to obtain a question score produces an increase in reliability, which is estimated by the Spearman-Brown formula.[7] The estimated reliability for Question 1 is .74, and that for Question 2 is .80.

---

6. _____, Score Interpretation Guide, College-Level Examination Program, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967, p. 31.

7. Magnusson, op. cit., p. 74.

Because the essay total score is the sum of the question scores, the reading reliability for the total is higher than that for either of the questions. The reading reliability of the essay total score is most appropriately estimated by the formula for computing the reliability of a linear composite, since the two questions (as established above) are not alternative forms representing the same domain of content.[8] The reading reliability of the essay total score is estimated to be .83, and this value is taken as the upper limit of reliability for the total essay test.

(4) The Lower Limit. The obtained correlation between Question 1 and Question 2 is used to estimate the lower limit of reliability. If each question were treated as a one-question test, the actual reliability per question could be obtained by giving an equivalent form of a question and correlating scores on both forms. Unreliability due both to grading and to fluctuations in performance would be reflected in such a "form-to-form" coefficient. It has already been demonstrated that Question 1 and Question 2 are not equivalent in terms of content. To the extent that the two questions are not equivalent, the correlation between them will underestimate the actual reliability of the question scores.

The correlation between the scores on Question 1 and Question 2 is .35. Again, because the essay total score includes both questions, the reliability of the total will be higher, and is estimated by the linear composite method to be .52. The actual reliability of the essay test therefore lies between the lower limit of .52 and the upper limit of .83.

(5) Reliability of the Composite Scores. The estimated reliability of the composite scores, based on reliability coefficients of .88 for the objective part and between .52 and .83 for the essay part, is between .80 and .90.

XII. Validity.

Course grades or other indicators of classroom achievement can be correlated with test scores to secure measures of concurrent validity. The CLEP Score Interpretation Guide reports correlations between scores on the "Analysis and Interpretation of Literature" examination and course grades before and after the final examination; the values are .42 and .54, respectively. As noted in the CLEP Guide,[9] these correlations should be interpreted with caution because of lack of uniformity in the procedures by which the data were obtained.

Course grades in freshman English earned by students in the CSUC norms sample correlated .40 with essay total scores. Because few grades below C are given, thus essentially limiting grades to three values (A, B, and C), the instructors were also asked to rank the students on a six-point performance scale. The correlation between essay total scores and ranks for

---

8. Nunnally, J. Psychometric Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967, pp. 226-230.

9. Op. cit., pp. 33, 34.

the CSUC students was .45. The lower correlation for grades reflects the fact that the grade scale has fewer discrete values than the rank scale, resulting in a loss of variance in the grades.

Data from the UC norms sample were used to obtain correlations between essay total scores and both grades and ranks. The coefficient for grades was .33, and for ranks, .39. All the values cited in this section reflect unreliability in grading due to the varying standards used by different instructors, and should be interpreted only as gross approximations, if not as underestimates, of concurrent validity.

APPENDIX B

English Equivalency Examination 1973-74

Budget

START-UP COSTS:

	Budgeted	Spent
Personal Services	$ 14,215.	$ 12,738.
Operating Expenses	7,300.	6,447.
Total Budget	$ 21,515.	$ 19,185.

Note: The above includes administrative time, secretarial and student assistant help, printing (brochure and essay test questions), mailing (including pass/fail letters), and travel (including that of various faculty committees).

READING COSTS:

	Budgeted	Spent
Readers and Professional Team	$ 27,300.	$ 19,900.
Aides	2,301.	1,988.
Operating Expenses	19,747.	9,205.
Total Budget	$49,348.	$31,093.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Converted Essay Scores
Total Application Population

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	9	0.2	0.2
25-29	36	1.0	1.2
30-34	158	4.4	5.6
35-39	520	14.4	20.0
40-44	440	12.1	32.1
45-49	554	15.3	47.4
50-54	918	25.3	72.7
55-59	571	15.8	88.5
60-64	299	8.3	96.7
65-69	92	2.5	99.3
70-74	23	0.6	99.9
75-79	3	0.1	100.0
Total	3623*	100.0	

Mean = 48.620 Median = 48.659 Mode = 46.000

Standard Deviation = 9.172

*16 Applicants did not complete Essay Examination

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Objective Scores
Total Applicant Population

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	6	0.2	0.2
25-29	45	1.2	1.4
30-34	141	3.9	5.3
35-39	323	8.9	14.2
40-44	612	16.8	31.0
45-49	720	19.8	50.8
50-54	674	18.5	69.3
55-59	608	16.7	86.0
60-64	349	9.6	95.6
65-69	138	3.8	99.4
70-74	23	0.6	100.0
75-79	-	-	-
Total	3639	100.0	

Mean = 49.402 Median = 49.347 Mode = 49.000

Standard Deviation = 9.023

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Composite Scores

Total Applicant Population

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
45-54	7	0.2	0.2
55-64	58	1.6	1.8
65-74	168	4.6	6.4
75-84	492	13.6	20.0
85-94	798	22.0	42.0
95-104	812	22.4	64.4
105-114	709	19.6	84.0
115-124	411	11.3	95.4
125-134	142	3.9	99.3
135-144	26	0.7	100.0
Total	3623*	100.0	

Mean = 98.064 Median = 97.958 Mode = 97.000

Standard Deviation = 15.858

*16 Applicants did not complete Essay Examination

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Converted Essay Scores of Those Applicants Who Passed

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
53	166	16.0	16.0
56	268	25.9	41.9
59	202	19.5	61.4
61	160	15.4	76.8
63	126	12.2	89.0
66	57	5.5	94.5
69	31	3.0	97.5
71	17	1.6	99.1
73	6	0.6	99.7
75	3	0.3	100.0
Total	1036	100.0	

Mean = 59.067 Median = 58.540 Mode = 56.0

Standard Deviation = 4.539

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Objective Scores of those Applicants who Passed

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
45-47	30	2.9	2.9
48-50	94	9.1	12.0
51-53	153	14.7	26.7
54-56	185	17.9	44.6
57-59	198	19.1	63.7
60-62	156	15.1	78.8
63-65	128	12.3	91.1
66-68	60	5.8	96.9
69-71	27	2.6	99.5
72-74	5	0.5	100.0
Total	1036	100.0	

Mean = 57.517 Median = 57.191 Mode = 55.000

Standard Deviation = 5.780

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Composite Scores for those Applicants who Passed

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
105-109	202	19.5	19.5
110-114	274	26.4	45.9
115-119	230	22.2	68.1
120-124	162	15.7	83.8
125-129	102	9.8	93.6
130-134	40	3.9	97.5
135-139	18	1.7	99.2
140-144	8	0.8	100.0
Total	1,036	100.0	

Mean = 116.584 Median = 115.357 Mode = 108.000

Standard Deviation = 7.723

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Converted Essay Scores of those Applicants who did not Pass

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	9	0.3	0.3
25-29	36	1.4	1.7
30-34	158	6.1	7.8
35-39	520	20.1	27.9
40-44	440	17.1	45.0
45-49	554	21.4	66.4
50-54	752	29.0	95.4
55-59	101	3.9	99.3
60-64	13	0.5	99.8
65-69	4	0.2	100.0
Total	2587	100.0	

Mean = 44.437 Median = 44.942 Mode = 46.000

Standard Deviation = 6.954

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Objective Scores of those Applicants who did not Pass

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-24	6	0.2	0.2
25-29	43	1.7	1.9
30-34	140	5.4	7.3
35-39	316	12.2	19.5
40-44	608	23.5	43.0
45-49	615	23.8	66.8
50-54	477	18.4	85.2
55-59	249	9.7	94.9
60-64	101	3.9	98.8
65-69	30	1.1	99.9
70-74	2	0.1	100.0
Total	2587	100.0	

Mean = 46.211 Median = 46.129 Mode = 44.000
Standard Deviation = 7.974

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Distribution of Composite Scores of those Applicants who did not Pass

Score	Frequency	Relative Percent	Cumulative Percent
45-49	1	0.0	0.0
50-54	6	0.3	0.3
55-59	18	0.7	1.0
60-64	40	1.5	2.5
65-69	71	2.8	5.3
70-74	97	3.7	9.0
75-79	198	7.7	16.7
80-84	294	11.3	28.0
85-89	380	14.7	42.7
90-94	418	16.2	58.9
95-99	420	16.2	75.1
100-104	392	15.2	90.3
105-109	183	7.0	97.3
110-114	50	2.0	99.3
115-119	18	0.7	100.0
120-124	1	0.0	100.0
Total	2587	100.0	

Mean = 90.648 Median = 91.716 Mode = 97.000

Standard Deviation = 11.658

TCSUC - Institutional Research
November 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Total Applicants by Age Category

Age Category	Failed			Passed			Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 and under	12	0.5	0.5	3	0.3	0.3	15	0.4	0.4
17	160	6.2	6.7	100	9.7	10.0	260	7.2	7.6
18	2065	79.6	86.3	780	75.8	85.8	2845	78.5	86.1
19	257	9.9	96.2	91	8.8	94.6	348	9.6	95.7
20	26	1.0	97.2	8	0.8	95.4	34	0.9	96.6
21	19	0.8	98.0	9	0.9	96.3	28	0.8	97.4
22	9	0.3	98.3	2	0.2	96.5	11	0.3	97.7
23	5	0.2	98.5	4	0.4	96.9	9	0.3	98.0
24	8	0.3	98.8	4	0.4	97.3	12	0.3	98.3
25 - 29	9	0.3	99.1	10	1.0	98.3	19	0.5	98.8
30 - 34	11	0.4	99.5	3	0.3	98.6	14	0.4	99.2
35 and over	13	0.5	100.0	15	1.4	100.0	28	0.8	100.0
All Ages	2594	71.6		1029	28.4		3623*	100.0	

*Age and/or Sex data Unobtainable from 16 Applicants

TCSUC - Institutional Research
January 1975

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Male Applicants by Age Category

Age Category	Failed			Passed			Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 and under	7	0.6	0.6	2	0.6	0.6	9	0.6	0.6
17	51	4.6	5.2	31	9.3	9.9	82	5.7	6.3
18	879	78.8	84.0	250	75.4	85.3	1129	78.0	84.3
19	127	11.4	95.4	31	9.3	94.6	158	10.9	95.2
20	17	1.6	97.0	3	0.9	95.5	20	1.4	96.6
21	11	1.0	98.0	3	0.9	96.4	14	1.0	97.6
22	5	0.4	98.4	2	0.6	97.0	7	0.5	98.1
23	2	0.2	98.6	0	0.0	97.0	2	0.2	98.3
24	3	0.3	98.9	2	0.6	97.6	5	0.3	98.6
25 - 29	5	0.4	99.3	2	0.6	98.2	7	0.5	99.1
30 - 34	5	0.4	99.7	0	0.0	98.2	5	0.3	99.4
35 and over	3	0.3	100.0	6	1.8	100.0	9	0.6	100.0
All Ages	1115	77.0	-	332	23.0	-	1447*	100.0	-

*Age and/or Sex data Unobtainable from 16 Applicants

TCSUC - Institutional Research
January 1975

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Female Applicants by Age Category

Age Category	Failed			Passed			Total		
	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%	N	Rel.%	Cum.%
16 and under	5	0.3	0.3	1	0.1	0.1	6	0.3	0.3
17	109	7.4	7.7	69	9.9	10.0	178	8.2	8.5
18	1186	80.2	87.9	530	76.1	86.1	1716	78.9	87.4
19	130	8.8	96.7	60	8.6	94.7	190	8.7	96.1
20	9	0.6	97.3	5	0.7	95.4	14	0.6	96.7
21	8	0.5	97.8	6	0.9	96.3	14	0.6	97.3
22	4	0.3	98.1	0	0.0	96.3	4	0.2	97.5
23	3	0.2	98.3	4	0.6	96.9	7	0.3	97.8
24	5	0.3	98.6	2	0.3	97.2	7	0.3	98.1
25 - 29	4	0.3	98.9	8	1.1	98.3	12	0.6	98.7
30 - 34	6	0.4	99.3	3	0.4	98.7	9	0.4	99.1
35 and over	10	0.7	100.0	9	1.3	100.0	19	0.9	100.0
All Ages	1479	68.0		697	32.0		2176*	100.0	

*Age and/or Sex data Unobtainable from 16 Applicants

TCSUC - Institutional Research
January 1975

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Intercorrelations Among Part and Composite Scores
Total Applicant Population

	Essay #1		Essay #2					
	Read. 1	Read. 2	Read. 1	Read. 2	Essay Total	Essay Conv.	Objective	Composite
Essay #1								
Read. 1		.5736	.2717	.2833	.6948	.6966	.3337	.5899
Read. 2			.2590	.2679	.6859	.6873	.3195	.5763
Essay #2								
Read. 1				.6473	.7666	.7601	.4349	.6847
Read. 2					.7735	.7655	.4542	.6989
Essay Tot.						.9956	.5274	.8732
Essay Conv.							.5225	.8750
Objective								.8598

TCSUC - Institutional Research
Nov 1974

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
English Equivalency Examination - Spring 1974

Intercorrelations Among Grouped Essay and Composite Scores
Total Applicant Population

	Question 1	Question 2	Essay Total	Essay Conv.	Objective	Composite
Question 1		.3381	.7790	.7807	.3683	.6579
Question 2			.8488	.8408	.4905	.7628
Essay Total				.9956	.5274	.8732
Essay Conv.					.5225	.8750
Objective						.8598